

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Cases: 5:18-cv-01551-JLS-KK Arthur Ramos v. Schenker, Inc. et al    Date: December 20, 2018  
5:18-cv-01728-JLS-KK Enrique Juarez v. Schenker, Inc., et al  
5:18-cv-01931-JLS-KK Armando Fernandez v. Schenker, Inc.  
5:18-cv-02129-JLS-KK Tabitha Parker et al v. Schenker, Inc. et al

---

Present: **HONORABLE JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Terry Guerrero  
Deputy Clerk

N/A  
Court Reporter

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

Not Present

**Proceedings:            (In Chambers) ORDER CONSOLIDATING ALL CASES**

On November 1, 2018, the Court CONSOLIDATED the first three above-referenced cases for all purposes. (18-1551 Doc. 30.)

The Court also ordered the parties in *Parker v. Schenker, Inc.* to show cause why it should not be consolidated with the others. (*Id.*) The Court has reviewed the response of Defendant Primeskill Staffing Services. (18-2129 Doc. 16.) Primeskill contends that it will be “forced to be involved in three actions in which it has no involvement,” and that costs would increase because it would be required to spend additional time to address claims that are not asserted against it. (*Id.* at 3-4.) This argument is unpersuasive. Primeskill is required to address only those claims actually asserted against it by a plaintiff with standing to assert those claims.

Consolidation of civil cases is an administrative tool that has long been used by courts to manage cases with common questions of law and/or fact. The Supreme Court recently discussed the history of consolidation of civil cases. The Court noted that as far back as 1852, consolidation was never meant to “completely merg[e] the constituent cases into one, [and instead] enable[ed] more efficient case management while preserving the distinct identities of the cases and the rights of the separate parties in them.” *Hall v. Hall*, 138 S. Ct. 1118, 1125 (2018) (citing *Rich v. Lambert*, 12 How. 347, 13 L.Ed. 1017 (1852)). When Rule 42 was adopted in 1937, it did not alter this settled understanding. *Hall*, 138 S.Ct. at 1131. It is the same today.

With this understanding, the Court finds that *Parker v. Schenker, Inc.*, is appropriate for consolidation pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a).

---

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL**

Cases: 5:18-cv-01551-JLS-KK Arthur Ramos v. Schenker, Inc. et al    Date: December 20, 2018  
5:18-cv-01728-JLS-KK Enrique Juarez v. Schenker, Inc., et al  
5:18-cv-01931-JLS-KK Armando Fernandez v. Schenker, Inc.  
5:18-cv-02129-JLS-KK Tabitha Parker et al v. Schenker, Inc. et al

---

The Clerk is directed to administratively close all but the lowest case number referenced above. The parties are directed to make all their filings on the docket of the lead case.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Initials of Preparer: tg